



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1438
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,071	04/01/2004	Reuben S. Fischman	014.0038 (02798.0008.NPUS	2682
29906	7590	05/22/2007	EXAMINER	
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			RIAD, AMINE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-81 have been presented for examination.

Claims 1-81 have been rejected.

Objection

Claims 7,30,40,64 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 6,29,39,63. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 34-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

In summary, Claims 34-57 partly recite:

a computer readable medium for decision analysis and resolution, wherein an event is associated with a root cause, the computer readable medium comprising:

Art Unit: 2113

The recited invention is a group of instruction or logic, which constitutes a program. A computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer. Thus, a program stored in a computer readable medium is only code with no result, in order to have a result the program needs to be executable. Examiner strongly suggests using "executable" language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,34, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kidder U.S. Patent 6,445,774.

In regard to claims 1,34,58

Kidder discloses a method for decision analysis and resolution, wherein an event is associated with a root cause, the method comprising the steps of:

- relating a solution to the root cause; (Abstract; "An automated workflow system provides automated alarm report dissemination and processing. The automated workflow system provides a graphical interface to view and manipulate alarms reports and to automatically create and handle **event reports** and trouble tickets. **The workflow system also allows network monitors to identify which**

Art Unit: 2113

network component within the network generated the alarm {this is the root cause}”[Examiner considers handling an event report as solving the event])

- determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically; (Column 4; lines 49-50 “ these tools automate network monitor such as ...and updating alarm report status to indicate which alarm reports have been cleared by the closing of an event”) [Examiner considers when a report is cleared, it is determined that the solution resolved the event]

- automatically resolving the event when the event can be resolved

automatically;(Column 9; line 44 “These tools automate network monitor”)

and providing information for resolving the event to a user when the event cannot be resolved automatically. (Column 4; line 45 “creating trouble tickets against events”)

Examiner considers a trouble ticket as information presented to the user for resolving the problem.]

In regard to claims 4,37,61

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes interoperating with a trouble ticket system.(Column 4; lines 44-46

"These tools automate network monitor procedures such as creating events, assigning alarm reports to events, creating trouble tickets against events. ")

In regard to claims 9,42,66

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes using object-oriented constructs.

Art Unit: 2113

(Figure 4; Items 410 and 411 [a Graphical User Interface is object oriented])

In regard to claims 10,43,67

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes allowing a user to prevent automated resolution. (Column 6; line 61 “as person, one skilled in the art will recognize that the functions of the network monitors may be alternatively provided, for example, by automated or **semi automated apparatus**”)

In regard to claims 11,44,68

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of automatically resolving the event includes providing information to a user by updating a trouble ticket. (Column 9; lines 35-36 “In addition to event reports, the event database 415 may also store and maintain trouble tickets”)

In regard to claims 14,47,71

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes utilizing an object oriented model to define object constructs, wherein the constructs are then presented to the user. (Column 13; lines 18-21 “ A network monitor after creating an event report can open a trouble ticket against that event report. This is done with the client GUI which provides functions for selecting event report and trouble ticket functions.”)

In regard to claims 15,48,72

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes a visualization of the information for resolving the

Art Unit: 2113

event. (Column 13; lines 21-22“ The clients GUI also provides functions for comments, remarks, and activities.” Examiner considers the comment remarks and activities as visualization)

In regard to claims 16,49,73

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes a visualization of the information for resolving the event, wherein the visualization includes providing an overlay, wherein the overlay offers information about the event. (Figure 5)

In regard to claims 17,50,74

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes providing a searchable knowledge base. (Figure 4; item 415 [an event database is a searchable knowledge base])

In regard to claims 19,52,76

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the method is practiced in a network, further including the step of revising the network based on data generated while resolving the event. (Column 9; lines 3-4 “The workflow LCA automatically retrieves the alarm reports that are created by the network management system and that correspond to the created event report and enhances these alarm reports with network topology and site data”)

In regard to claims 20,53,77

Kidder discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of revising the network includes revising a data store within the network based on the event resolution. (Column

Art Unit: 2113

13; lines 43-45 "As changes in status are received, the automated workflow system corresponding updates associated event and alarm reports")

In regard to claims 21,54,78

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the method is practiced in a network, further including the step of distributing solutions in the network. (Summary "Alarm report which correspond to alarms generated by the telecommunication network, are provided by a network management system to network monitors. The network monitor can use the event report in resolving the alarm report") [Examiner considers resolving the different alarms coming from different part of the network as distributing resolution]

In regard to claims 23,56,80

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the event is associated with a security fault. (Figure 3; item 301a network component could a firewall which is a security component)

In regard to claims 24,57,81

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the event is associated with a network operational fault. (Column 5; lines 34-36)

In regard to claim 25

Kidder discloses a network system configured to resolve network problem events correlated to root causes in an object-oriented environment, including:

- a resolution module configured to generate a proposed response to the detected event; (Figure 2; item 204)

Art Unit: 2113

- and a solution module configured to resolve the detected event using the proposed response, wherein the resolution module is configured to cooperate with the solution module to automatically implement the proposed response, (Figure 2; item 203) wherein the resolution module is configured to cooperate with the solution module to present the proposed response as a suggested response to resolve the detected event. (Column 6; lines 55-58)

In regard to claim 26

Kidder discloses the system of claim 25, further including a user input module configured to allow a network user to initiate implementation of the proposed response.(Column 6; lines 60-61)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,35,and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58

Art Unit: 2113

Kidder does not disclose the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes utilizing a solutions catalog.

Valadarsky teaches that the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes utilizing a solution catalog. (Column 2; lines 39-41 "TRS stores its results in a history database. Users can review the decision it made, and the alarm groups it correlated, long after the faults that generated those decisions and alarm groups have been resolved") [Examiner considers the decision it made as solutions]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate utilizing a solution catalog of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing a solution catalog of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 3,36,60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose relating a solution to a root cause includes chaining a series of solution objects to the root cause

Art Unit: 2113

Valadarsky teaches relating a solution to a root cause includes chaining a series of solution objects to the root cause (Column 2; lines 12-13 "TRS uses graph traverse in order to find the root")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate chaining a series of solution object to the root cause of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply chaining a series of solution object to the root cause of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses, "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 8,41,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58

Kidder does not disclose the steps of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event

Valadarsky teaches the steps of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant

Art Unit: 2113

correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event. (Column 2; line 16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 5,38,62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution.

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution (Figure 24; item = Corrective Action Helper)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 6,39,63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58

Kidder does not disclose that the validity of the solution is based upon previous success in resolving the event and descriptions of the related root cause

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches that the validity of the solution is based upon previous success in resolving the event and descriptions of the related root cause (Figure 22; item =comment editor)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate basing the solution upon previous success in resolving the event of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply basing the solution upon previous success in resolving the event of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 8,41,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event.

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event. (Column 14; lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 12,45,69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose presenting the user with suggested corrective actions

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches presenting the user with suggested corrective actions (Column 3; lines 52-54 and figure 24)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate presenting the user with suggested corrective actions of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply presenting the user with suggested corrective actions of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 13,46,70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes evaluating the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct

Paradies teaches the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes evaluating the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct (Column 14; lines 54-59)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 22,27,55,76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions.

Paradise teaches creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions. (Column 16; lines 65-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the

heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 18,51,75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution.

Paradies teaches providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution.(Column 14; lines 65-66 [the number is considered as an association probability])

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolution of similar detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolution of similar detected events.(Column 14; lines 59-61)

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolutions of detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolutions of detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S. Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S. Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1, 34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events.

(Column 14; lines 59-61)

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

In regard to claim 32

Claim 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.(Column 11;

Art Unit: 2113

lines 16-17 "at any level of analysis is considered as a predetermined success threshold")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional

Art Unit: 2113

reposes has been reached (Column 11; lines 16-17 "at any level of analysis is considered as a predetermined success threshold ")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional responses has been reached of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional responses has been reached of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 6,006,016 covers most of the limitations, but lacks the solution determination. The same is valid for U.S. Patent 7,043,661 see PTO 892.

Contact


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amine Riad whose telephone number is 571-272-8185. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

Art Unit: 2113

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR
Amine Riad
Patent Examiner
5/10/07


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100